arXiv:1601.01964v1 [physics.flu-dyn] 7 Jan 2016

Double-diffusive magnetorotational instability of super-rotation under the influence of azimuthal magnetic fields

G. Rüdiger, M. Gellert, M. Schultz
Leibniz-Institut für Astrophysik Potsdam, An der Sternwarte 16, D-14482 Potsdam, Germany

F. Stefani
Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, PF 510119, 01314 Dresden, Germany

(Dated: January 11, 2016)

It is demonstrated that the Azimuthal MagnetoRotational Instability (AMRI) also works with super-rotation contrary to the standard MRI for axial fields which *requires* negative shear. The stability against nonaxisymmetric perturbations of a conducting Taylor-Couette flow with positive shear under the influence of a toroidal magnetic field is considered which can indeed be unstable even if the field between the cylinders is current-free. This phenomenon is identified as a double-diffusive instability which only works for small or large magnetic Prandtl number Pm. For all Pm the unstable combinations of rotation and field lead to magnetic Mach numbers below unity. For small Pm the curves of marginal instability in the Hartmann/Reynolds number plane do not differ for differing Pm.

For models with resting inner cylinder it is demonstrated that experiments to realize this form of AMRI with liquid sodium need axial electric currents of about 33 kAmp flowing inside the inner cylinder at $r_{\rm in} = 0.8$, independent of the global scales of the container. Moreover, the instability of the super-rotation with not too small Reynolds number is only weakly influenced by the radial profile of the field. The lines of marginal instability are very similar for the fields with the profiles between $B_\phi \propto 1/R$ ('current-free') and $B_\phi \propto R$ ('z pinch').

PACS numbers:

INTRODUCTION

In recent years instabilities in rotating conducting fluids under the influence of magnetic fields became of high interest. Especially in view of astrophysical applications the consideration of differential rotation is relevant. It has been known for a long time that differential rotation with negative shear ('sub-rotation') becomes unstable under the influence of an axial field [1]. When considered separately, both ingredients of the MagnetoRotational Instability (MRI), i.e. the axial field and also the Kepler rotation, are stable. The full system proves to be unstable if and only if the fluid is sub-rotating.

For ideal fluids the criterion of stability against axisymmetric perturbations of differential rotation under the presence of *toroidal* fields reads

$$\frac{1}{R^3}\frac{\rm d}{{\rm d}R}(R^2\Omega)^2 - \frac{R}{\mu_0\rho}\frac{\rm d}{{\rm d}R}\left(\frac{B_\phi}{R}\right)^2 > 0, \qquad (1)$$

where μ_0 is the permeability and ρ the density [2]. In this relation the existence of axisymmetric kinetic and magnetic perturbations depends solely on the radial profile of the rotation law. The stability problem of toroidal fields plus differential rotation in cylindric geometry has been studied by several authors often considering the perturbations as axisymmetric, [3–11] .

After (1) solid-body rotation and all kinds of super-rotation ("positive radial shear) are *stabilized* by the magnetic field unless the field strongly increases outwards. The profiles $B_\phi \propto 1/R$ (current-free between the cylinders) and $B_\phi \propto R$ (z-pinch, homogeneous axial electric-current, see [12]) cannot destabilize any form of super-rotation if only axisymmetric perturbations are considered. It has been demonstrated that for fields with $B_\phi \propto 1/R$ *all* Taylor-Couette flows are stable against axisymmetric perturbations. The Azimuthal MagnetoRotational Instability (AMRI) is thus basically nonaxisymmetric [10].

Taylor-Couette flows with positive shear are the prototype of hydrodynamic stability, [13, 14]. The more surprising is the finding that even weak magnetic toroidal fields can easily destabilize such flows if also nonaxisymmetric perturbations are taken into account, [18, 20]. We shall even demonstrate that the radial profile of the fields – if not too steep – does not play an important role to allow instability. On the other hand, the new instability is a double-diffusive phenomenon which does not appear if the molecular viscosity and the molecular magnetic resistivity are of the same order.

THE EQUATIONS

The equations of the problem are

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{U}}{\partial t} + (\boldsymbol{U}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{U} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\nabla P + \nu\Delta\boldsymbol{U} + \frac{1}{\mu_0\rho}{\rm curl}\boldsymbol{B}\times\boldsymbol{B}$$
$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{B}}{\partial t} = {\rm curl}(\boldsymbol{U}\times\boldsymbol{B}) + \eta\Delta\boldsymbol{B} \qquad (2)$$

with div $\boldsymbol{U}$ = div $\boldsymbol{B} = 0$ for an incompressible fluid. $\boldsymbol{U}$ is the velocity, $\boldsymbol{B}$ the magnetic field, P the pressure, ν the kinematic viscosity and η is the magnetic diffusivity. The basic state in the cylindric system with the coordinates R, ϕ, z is $U_R = U_z = B_R = B_z = 0$ for the poloidal components and $\Omega =$

$a_\Omega + b_\Omega/R^2$ for the rotation law with the constants

$$a_\Omega = \frac{\mu_\Omega - r_{\rm in}^2}{1-r_{\rm in}^2}\Omega_{\rm in}, \qquad b_\Omega = \frac{1-\mu_\Omega}{1-r_{\rm in}^2}\Omega_{\rm in}R_{\rm in}^2. \qquad (3)$$

Here $r_{\rm in} = R_{\rm in}/R_{\rm out}$ with $R_{\rm in}$ and $R_{\rm out}$ as the radii and $\Omega_{\rm in}$ as the angular velocity of the inner cylinder. With $\mu_\Omega = \Omega_{\rm out}/\Omega_{\rm in}$ super-rotation is represented by $\mu_\Omega > 1$.

For the magnetic field the stationary solution is

$$B_\phi = a_B R + \frac{b_B}{R}. \qquad (4)$$

The radial magnetic profile $B_\phi \propto R$ is due to an applied homogeneous axial electric current ('z-pinch') while $B_\phi \propto 1/R$ is current-free in the fluid. We define $\mu_B = B_{\rm out}/B_{\rm in}$. Almost always $r_{\rm in} = 0.9$ is chosen. The current-free field is then given by $\mu_B = 0.9$ and the field in the z-pinch is $\mu_B = 1.1$.

The dimensionless physical parameters of the system are the magnetic Prandtl number Pm, the Hartmann number Ha and the Reynolds number Re, i.e.

$$\mathrm{Pm} = \frac{\nu}{\eta}, \qquad \mathrm{Ha} = \frac{B_{\rm in}D}{\sqrt{\mu_0\rho\nu\eta}}, \qquad \mathrm{Re} = \frac{\Omega_{\rm out}D^2}{\nu}. \qquad (5)$$

These three parameters combine to the magnetic Mach number $\mathrm{Mm} = \sqrt{\mathrm{Pm}}\mathrm{Re}/\mathrm{Ha}$ indicating whether the rotation energy dominates the magnetic energy or not.

A linear code is used to solve the set of ordinary differential equations for the radial functions of flow, field and pressure which results after a Fourier mode transformation $F = F(R)\exp\big(\mathrm{i}(kz + m\phi + \omega t)\big)$ of the fluctuations. The solutions are optimized with respect to the Reynolds number for given Hartmann number by varying the wave number. Only solutions for $|m| = 1$ are discussed in this Letter. The hydrodynamic boundary conditions at the cylinder walls are assumed as $u_R = u_\phi = u_z = 0$. The cylinders are made from perfect-conducting or – in one case – from insulating material. For the conducting walls the fluctuations $\boldsymbol{b}$ must fulfill $\mathrm{d}b_\phi/\mathrm{d}R + b_\phi/R = b_R = 0$ at both $R_{\rm in}$ and $R_{\rm out}$ so that ten boundary conditions exist for the set of ten differential equations (see [15]). For $B_z = 0$ one can easily show that the system is degenerated under the transformation $m \to -m$ so that all eigenvalues (for specific Re and Ha) are valid for each pair $m = \pm 1$.

AZIMUTHAL MAGNETOROTATIONAL INSTABILITY

We start with rotation laws where the outer cylinder rotates with higher frequency than the inner cylinder. For the small magnetic Prandtl number of $\mathrm{Pm} = 10^{-5}$ Fig. 1 presents the lines of marginal instability (i.e. for vanishing growth rate) for the two rotation profiles with $\mu_\Omega = 1.9$ and $\mu_\Omega = 2.3$. The magnetic field between the cylinders is fixed to the vacuum-type, $B_\phi \propto 1/R$. The form of the resulting lines corresponds to the general form of the lines for the AMRI (with sub-rotation) where the line of marginal instability forms a tilted conus where both branches have a positive slope, [15, 16]. Absolute minima of the Hartmann number and the Reynolds number exist, below which the rotation law is stable. Above the minima the instability domain is always limited by two critical values of the Hartmann number or the Reynolds number. For a given (supercritical) Reynolds number there is a minimum magnetic field for the instability and there is a maximum magnetic field suppressing the instability. Above the weak-field branch the rotational shear is too strong to support nonaxisymmetric perturbations.



FIG. 1: The instability cones for the two super-rotation profiles with $\mu_\Omega = 1.9$ (cross-hatched) and $\mu_\Omega = 2.3$ (hatched). $\mathrm{Pm} = 10^{-5}$. $r_{\rm in} = 0.9$, $\mu_B = 0.9$, $m = \pm 1$, perfect-conducting cylinders.

The magnetic Mach number for both curves is always smaller than unity hence for instability the magnetic field must be strong.



FIG. 2: The wave numbers kD (left panel) and the drift frequency $\omega_{\rm dr}/\Omega_{\rm out}$ (right panel) along the lines of marginal instability for $\mathrm{Pm} = 10^{-5}$ ($\mu_\Omega = 5.0, 2.3, 1.9$, from left to right) and $\mathrm{Pm} = 10$ ($\mu_\Omega = 5.0$). $r_{\rm in} = 0.9$, $\mu_B = 0.9$, $m = \pm 1$, perfect-conducting cylinders.

To become unstable the flat rotation law with $\mu_\Omega = 1.9$ requires much higher Hartmann numbers and Reynolds numbers than the steeper rotation law with $\mu_\Omega = 2.3$. The rotation law with $\mu_\Omega \lesssim 1.9$ nowhere within the gap reaches the minimum Rossby number $\mathrm{Ro} = (1/2)\mathrm{d}\log\Omega/\mathrm{d}\log R = 4.8$ which is found by local approximations of the solution of (2) as a lower limit which should be exceeded for instability [17, 18]. The reason might be that, as the plots also show, this Rossby number is by far not uniform over the radius for Taylor-Couette flows. They also demonstrate that a lower limit does not exist for perfect-conducting boundaries at the mentioned value. It is clear, however, that for more

and more flat rotation law the supercritical Reynolds numbers and Hartmann numbers are growing. The question is whether a minimum value $\mu_\Omega > 1$ indeed exists for which the critical Reynolds number and Hartmann number reach infinity. Whether such a limit exists below $\mu_\Omega = 1.9$ is not yet finally clear for numerical reasons.

Wave numbers and azimuthal pattern migration

The left panel of Fig. 2 gives the optimized wave numbers of the instability normalized with the gap width D along the two branches of instability for small and large Pm. The axial size of cell is $\delta z/D \simeq \pi/k$. Cells with $k < \pi$ are thus prolate while cells with $k > \pi$ are oblate with respect to the rotaion axis. The limit $k = \pi$ for nearly spherical cells is marked by a horizontal dotted line. The plot demonstrates that the cell geometry strongly depends on the magnetic Prandtl number. For small Pm also the wave numbers are small hence the cells are prolate or spherical. Along the strong-field (lower) branch of the instability cone the wave numbers exceed those at the low-field (upper) branch where the cells are rather long in axial direction. For Pm $\gg 1$, however, the wave numbers at both branches of the conus are larger than π so that the cells are always very flat.

Also the drift rates possess a strong Pm-dependence. The drift values as given in the right panel of Fig. 2 are the real parts $\omega_{\rm dr}$ of the frequency ω of the Fourier mode of the instability, normalized with the rotation rate of the *outer* cylinder. Because of $\dot\phi = -\omega_{\rm dr}/m$ the azimuthal migration has the opposite sign of $\omega_{\rm dr}$. For AMRI with negative shear we always found that the pattern migrates for all Pm in positive ϕ-direction ([19]). For Tayler instability under the influence of super-rotation the situation is more complicated as the pattern counterrotates for small Pm while it corotates for Pm > 1, [20]. The plot in Fig. 2 shows similar results. For small Pm positive $\omega_{\rm dr}$ occur and the perturbation pattern indeed rotates *backwards*. Large Pm provide negative drift values hence the pattern migrates with the rotation. For $\omega_{\rm dr}/\Omega_{\rm out} = -1$ the pattern rotates just as the outer cylinder (only possible for large Pm).

Influences of the magnetic Prandtl number and boundary conditions

Figure 3 gives the coordinates of the locations with minimum Hartmann number shown in Fig. 1 for $\mu_\Omega = 2.3$ but for various Pm. One finds that for Pm $\to 0$ both the Hartmann number and the Reynolds number converge (to Ha $\simeq 400$ and Re $\simeq 2000$). The curves scale, therefore, with Ha and Re for small Pm, so that the numerical values of Ha and Re given in Fig. 1 for Pm $= 10^{-5}$ (sodium) can also be used for the smaller value of gallium.

On the other hand, for increasing Pm the minimum Hartmann number and the Reynolds number are (slightly) reduced.



FIG. 3: The minimum values of Ha and their corresponding Reynolds numbers from the curves of marginal instability shown in Fig. 1 for $\mu_\Omega = 2.3$ vs. Pm. For Pm $> 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$ no solution exists. For $r_{\rm in} = 0.8$ the Hartmann numbers (crosses) and Reynolds numbers (squares) for $\mu_\Omega = 4$ (up) and $\mu_\Omega = 128$ (down) are given but only for Pm $= 10^{-5}$.

More important is that the curves stop at Pm $\simeq 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$ indicating that for higher values of Pm no solutions unstable against perturbations with $m = 1$ exist. For Pm > 1, however, the instability resurrects with strikingly low Reynolds numbers (Fig. 4, right). The low Reynolds numbers ensure that also for large magnetic Prandtl numbers the magnetic Mach number remains smaller than unity. Instabilities which only exist for $\nu \neq \eta$ belong to the class of *double-diffusive* instabilities [21]. They do not appear for Pm ≈ 1.

To find out how strong the influence of the boundary condition is, Fig. 4 (left) gives the instability map for $\mu_\Omega = 5$ for the two cases of perfect-conducting walls and insulating boundary conditions. The application of the rather steep rotation law with $\mu_\Omega = 5$ has only numerical reasons, the magnetic Prandtl number of Pm $= 10^{-5}$ characterizes liquid sodium (for laboratory experiments). Note that for vacuum boundaries the super-rotation laws are much more stable than for perfect-conducting conditions. For AMRI with negative shear the critical Hartmann numbers for both kinds of boundary conditions do only slightly differ (but also with higher values for vacuum conditions). The influence of the boundary conditions is also large if the instability of the z-pinch under the presence of differential rotation is considered. Often, however, vacuum boundary conditions lead to a much easier excitation of the instability than the conducting conditions do, see [20].

One finds from the Figs. 1 – 4 the expected trend with μ_Ω for the minimum Reynolds number. For perfect-conducting boundaries and Pm $= 10^{-5}$ it decreases from 3500 for the flat rotation law ($\mu_\Omega = 1.9$) to 250 for the steeper rotation law ($\mu_\Omega = 5$).

RESTING INNER CYLINDER

A Taylor-Couette flow with resting inner cylinder is clearly the most simple model for super-rotating fluids. As it also



FIG. 4: Instability maps for $\mu_\Omega = 5$. Left panel: Pm $= 10^{-5}$ for perfect-conducting and insulating cylinders. Right panel: Pm $=$ 10, perfect-conducting cylinders. All curves of marginal instability fulfill the condition Mm < 1. $r_{\rm in} = 0.9$.



FIG. 5: Instability map for Taylor-Couette flows with resting inner cylinder. The radial profiles of the azimuthal background fields vary from $\mu_B = 1.1$ (z-pinch, thick lines) to $\mu_B = 0.9$ (AMRI, thin lines). Blue color: Pm $= 0.02$. Red color: Pm $= 10^{-5}$. $r_{\rm in} = 0.9$, perfect-conducting boundaries.

forms the steepest radial profile ($\mu_\Omega = \infty$) we expect the minimal Hartmann numbers which are suitable for a laboratory experiment (with cylinders from conducting material). The thin red line in Fig. 5 valid for the current-free field $B_\phi \propto 1/R$ and for Pm $= 10^{-5}$ provides a minimum Hartmann number of about 145. In order to transform this value to the necessary electric-current along the axis (i.e. within the inner cylinder) the well-known relation $I_{\rm axis} = 5 R_{\rm in} B_{\rm in}$ can be rewritten as

$$I_{\rm axis} = 5 \frac{R_{\rm in}}{D} \, {\rm Ha} \, \sqrt{\mu_0 \rho \nu \eta} = 5 \, {\rm Ha}_{\rm in} \sqrt{\mu_0 \rho \nu \eta}, \qquad (6)$$

with $\rm Ha_{in}$ as the Hartmann number after (5) formed with $R_{\rm in}$ instead with the gap width D. We find $\rm Ha_{in} = 1300$ or $I_{\rm axis} \simeq 53.5$ kAmp for liquid sodium as the conducting fluid (with $\sqrt{\mu_0 \rho \nu \eta} \simeq 8.2$ in c.g.s.). This is the minimum current for instability with the gap width $D = 0.1$. Another calculation for $D = 0.2$ and $\mu_\Omega = 128$ presented in Fig. 3 leads to $\rm Ha_{in} = 800$ with only 33 kAmp as the critical electric-current. Though the size of the container does not influence the critical value of the electric-current but the gap width does. The wider the gap the weaker the necessary current which is necessary to excite the AMRI for super-rotation.

Sofar we did not vary the radial profile $1/R$ of the magnetic background field. One of the new questions is, however, how sensitive the described instability of super-rotating fluids reacts on the presence of axial electric-currents within the fluid. In addition to the current-free field, in Fig. 5 the lines of marginal instability for the field $B_\phi \propto R$ of the z-pinch with uniform axial current are given for two different magnetic Prandtl numbers. As the new examples (thick lines) contain axial electric-current, the Tayler instability for Re $= 0$ appears at certain values $\rm Ha_{Tay}$ of the Hartmann number [22–25], which themselves do not change for changing Pm [26].

For larger Reynolds numbers – if the rotation becomes important – one finds only little differences of the lines of marginal instability for the two field profiles with or without axial electric background current in the fluid. The minimum Hartmann number for instability are slightly reduced by the currents but the differences are small. The main result is that the magnetic-induced instability of super-rotation in MHD Taylor-Couette flows does not strongly depend on the radial profile of the field. It already works for current-free fields but axial electric-currents do not basically change the system, which is even true for the z-pinch with its uniform current density.

[1] E.P. Velikhov, Sov. Phys. JETP **36**, 995 (1959)
[2] D. Michael, Mathematica **1**, 45 (1954)
[3] S. Chandrasekhar, *Hydrodynamic and Hydromagnetic Stability* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1961)
[4] L.N. Howard & A.S. Gupta, JFM **14**, 463 (1962)
[5] G. Chanmugam, MNRAS **187**, 769 (1979)
[6] D. Fearn, GAFD **30**, 227 (1984)
[7] E. Knobloch, MNRAS **255**, 25 (1992)
[8] B. Dubrulle & E. Knobloch, Astron. Astrophys. **274**, 667 (1993)
[9] M.E. Pessah & D. Psaltis, ApJ **628**, 879 (2005)
[10] I. Herron & F. Soliman, Appl. Math. Lett. **19**, 1113 (2006)
[11] D. Shalybkov, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 016302 (2006)
[12] H. Goedbloed & S. Poedts, *Principles of Magnetohydrodynamics* (Cambridge, University Press 2004)
[13] F. Wendt, Ingenieur-Archiv **4**, 577 (1933)
[14] F. Schultz-Grunow, ZAMM **39**, 101 (1959)
[15] G. Rüdiger, L.L. Kitchatinov, & R. Hollerbach, *Magnetic Processes in Astrophysics* (Wiley-VCH, 2013)
[16] R. Hollerbach, V. Teeluck, & G. Rüdiger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 044502 (2010)
[17] W. Liu, J. Goodman, & I. Herron, Phys. Rev. E. **74**, 6302 (2006)
[18] F. Stefani & O. Kirillov, Phys. Rev. E **92**, 051001(R) (2015)
[19] G. Rüdiger, M. Gellert, M. Schultz, et al., MNRAS **438**, 271 (2014)
[20] G. Rüdiger, M. Schultz, M. Gellert, & F. Stefani, Phys. Fluids, acc.. (2016)
[21] D.J. Acheson, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A **289**, 459 (1978)
[22] R.J. Tayler, Proc. Phys. Soc. **70**, 31 (1957)
[23] R.J. Tayler, MNRAS **161**, 365 (1973)
[24] Y.V. Vandakurov, Sov. Astron. **16**, 265 (1972)
[25] M. Seilmayer, F. Stefani, Th. Gundrum, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 244501 (2010)

[26] G. Rüdiger & M. Schultz, Astron. Nachr. **331**, 121 (2010)


6000
4000
2000
0
REYNOLDS NUMBER
1.9
2.3
0
200
400
600
800
1000
HARTMANN NUMBER